

Edited and published from Liverpool by John Pinsent, MA DPhil., Dept of Greek, The University, PO Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, who is the sole proprietor and to whom, addressed by name, subscriptions, and contributions on any subject of classical interest, should be sent, and to whom, also by name only, cheques and checks made payable.

RATES p.a. of 10 issues (not August and September): SURFACE £4 UK & Europe, \$(US)10 elsewhere
AIR £5.50 Europe, \$(US)20 N.America, \$(US)25 Australasia.
Canadian dollars acceptable at prevailing rate of exchange.

CONTENTS, the copyright of which is secured for the author at the end of each article.

ELIZABETH M. CRAIK (St. Andrews): *Homer's Dorians*

Review: A. J. WOODMAN (Leeds)

E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature; II Latin Literature*, Cambridge, University Press, 1982. Pp. xviii + 974. £40.00. ISBN 0 521 21043 7

94-101

102-108

'This number of *LCM*' is the first ever to carry only one article plus a review. That there is no more in the number is determined in the first place by the Post Office: 16pp. the maximum possible in the first stage of postal charges, and the desire to stay within that while increasing the content was the only reason for miniaturization (which now seems to have found a degree which all find at least tolerable). But it is also partly chance, which brought to the top of the pile the long article on a subject close to the Editor's heart (though his own approach to Homer is somewhat different), and which also sent the completed review of the new Cambridge History of Latin Literature. *LCM* now receives some new books for review, and such reviews are always published in the first number after they have been received - the reviews, that is, not the books: not all reviewers are as quick as the one to whom he entrusted the Cambridge History, and the Editor himself, wearing that hat, is as bad as some others. He also likes to give reviewers all the room they want: a long review discussion is more use to readers, and more like an article, than a short notice. The long article makes another point: *LCM* has never been, as some contributors seem to think, restricted to short notes of no more than 1000 or 2000 words (2 or 4 pages of the old format) nor has it any house style of style into which they should fall when writing for it, so that all the articles should read as if they were written by the same person. Only he himself prefers the unbuttoned style in which these notes are generally written, though contributors should avoid the excesses and the lapses of taste into which he sometimes is led. And while he is on at contributors, may he ask them to please be sure and put their name at the beginning or end of any typescript (or manuscript, typing is not mandatory) submitted. As the Editor does not employ referees he does not require anonymity.

Despite all this, the Editor might have contemplated a bumper number were it not that he is already late, not entirely for the respectable academic reason that he has been busy with examining, and, as he suspects may be many of his readers, somewhat exhausted at the end of what seems to have been a particularly hard and wearing academic year.

The reason for that is, of course, partly the cuts which have been hanging over all British Universities since October last. About which, however, remarkably little has been heard of late, and information from other Universities is scarce and mostly confidential gossip. Like Greek city-states, each University and each Department sees the other as a potential rival or even threat to its own survival, and is disposed to keep its own counsel and fight its own battles in isolation even at the risk of falling victim to some new Macedonian Department of Education or of Science. But here at Liverpool the new School has found itself a title and is proceeding to the election of a Head.

The title is School of Antiquity and Archaeology, a choice not irrelevant to those problems of scholarship and communication which the Editor raised earlier, and which lurk in the review of the *Cambridge History*. Antiquity is a respectable enough word, see the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* s.v. '4. The time of antiquity; esp. the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans ME. 5. The people (or writers, etc.) of ancient times collectively; the Ancients 1538' and the quotations '4. A. is like fame, *caput inter nubiles condit* BACON. 5. That indigested heap, and frie of Authors, which they call A. MILT.', though on that evidence a bit old-fashioned and possibly pejorative. But today it suggests Antiquities, and it does not emphasize (highlight?) the literary and linguistic element of our discipline and this is not entirely a good omen for the future. But one can see why that may be so. Literary studies should (for some of us at least) be founded on the language. But it is just that area in which students are increasingly less well grounded, and so they naturally incline to those areas in a Classical education which can make less demands of them in that respect. So the future may indeed lie with 'Studies', though we must surely make every effort to keep alive the languages, even if only for a few in an academic monastery.

Preaching again and buttoned rather than unbuttoned (the unbuttoned version of these notes was indiscreet and has been suppressed), so the Editor will lapse into silence, doubtless to the relief of his 350 subscribers (349 + 2 - 1) until October, when he promises a number containing more articles than ever before.

This is the slightly modified text of a paper read at a meeting of the Mycenaean Seminar at the Institute of Classical Studies on 11th November 1981. I am grateful to those who contributed to the discussion on that occasion.

'Hunt-the-Dorian' has become a tantalizing game. At times one has the impression of knowing more and more about less and less - not through increasing specialization on a narrow front, but because the more we pursue the elusive Dorian the less substance he seems to have. Are we merely chasing a will o' the wisp? In certain respects this may have been the case. I shall not be concerned with the 'Dorian Invasion', which seems to me well on the way to becoming one of the discarded myths of scholarship. The work of James Hooker has played an important part here (*Mycenaean Greece*, London 1976), and I am unconvinced by the objections to it raised by Paul Cartledge (*Sparta and Lakonia*, London 1979). We may discard the Dorian Invasion¹, but the Dorians are real enough, and, I believe, real enough already in Greece in the Late Bronze Age.

If some Sokrates were to press me to produce a definition of 'Dorian' in a Bronze Age context, I might respond in the fashion of the feeble interlocutors in Plato's dialogues, producing examples or describing traits. Of course, a definition depends on one's line of approach; and there are different strategies deployed by different players in the game of 'Hunt-the-Dorian'. We may approach the Dorians by way of archaeology (using the term 'Mycenaeans') or philology (using the term 'Achaians'), and define them as 'a category of Achaeans/Mycenaeans not easy to differentiate from other Achaeans/Mycenaeans'; or we may approach them by the route used here, by myth and cult. I mean myth and cult in the broadest sense: myth-history-traditions; cult-ritual-priesthoods². I draw also on place-names and personal-names (with genealogies): these often provide a crossing-point between philology and archaeology.

I must stress that I regard the archaeological and philological strategies as fundamentally important. But perhaps, for the moment, they have come to a stalemate. In the case of archaeology this is because of the achievements and advances of recent scholarship: the realization that archaeologically the Dorians do not exist - or rather that they cannot be archaeologically differentiated - is fundamental. The philological camp seems to be in some disarray. A theory recently propounded, that variant forms existing in the Linear B tablets belong to proto-Doric - a theory launched from a philological standpoint by J. Chadwick, 'Who were the Dorians?', *PdP* 31 (1976), 103-117, and elaborated on other fronts - seems to have won little general support. It would fit my own thesis perfectly, and I should be very glad to embrace it; but for the moment I feel bound to suspend judgement.

In any case, it seems to me wrong - and the source of much misunderstanding - to equate Dorian with Doric-speaking or with West-Greek-speaking. In the classical period 'Doric' is a linguistic term, 'Dorian' an ethnic one, relating to the beliefs a community held about its origins. Thus Halikarnassos was Dorian, but not Doric-speaking. And, of course, by literary convention, poets who did not view themselves as Dorians elected to write in Doric. The claim put forward by Kleomenes, οὐ Δωριεύς εἰμι ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός (Herodotus 5.72.4) - special pleading though it may be - illustrates the point: the Greeks' belief in their common origins. For the Bronze Age the situation is much more complex, and it is safer not to extrapolate.

Evidently many places later Dorian and Doric-speaking were settled in the Bronze Age, and it is legitimate to ask when and how they were 'Dorianized' - in the Bronze Age, or later. The answer is not necessarily the same in each case; and in any one case it may be complex, with different forms of speech co-existing at different times³. There are some striking echoes of Mycenaean Greek in late local Doric: perhaps the most remarkable is the presence of the term *ktoina*, with a similar sense to the *ko-to-na* of the Pylos tablets (a unit of land with religious associations), on the island of Syme in the Hellenistic period (L.R. Palmer, *The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts*, Oxford 1963, 195-6, n.1). Such a

1. R.M. Cook, 'The Dorian invasion', *PCPS* 188 (1962), 16-22, concluded, p.22, 'The Dorian invasion is not a subject that is worth much study'; see also Z. Rubinsohn, 'The Dorian invasion again', *PdP* 30 (1975), 105-131.
2. A similar approach has been followed, with much success, by B.C. Dietrich; see *The origins of Greek religion*, Berlin & New York 1974, and articles cited in bibliography there. Pioneer work was done by George Thomson, *Studies in ancient Greek society. The prehistoric Aegean*², London 1954, and by R.F. Willetts, *Cretan cults and festivals*, London 1962.
3. An examination of the extent and nature of the differences between the Doric dialect of different regions - especially of different regions of the Peloponnese - in the archaic period might be illuminating. The question of the development of the epichoric scripts is relevant too: the local differences - with use of san or sigma, and treatment of digamma - seem to indicate that contacts were not particularly close. But of course epigraphical evidence rarely goes as far back in time as one could wish, and it is often difficult to reconcile evidence of speech and evidence of writing - as in the paradox of the triumph of the Attic dialect, but the Ionic scripts, in the fourth century.

correspondence in the technical terminology of social organization and land tenure is impressive. I wish more such could be found.

The route I am following has its own difficulties and dangers. In using Homer as a source we must strike a balance between uncritical credulity and unwarranted scepticism, bearing in mind the nature of an heroic tradition and the manner of its transmission. An epic record will exaggerate the extent of a hero's kingdom and power, it will glorify or embellish the character of his exploits; but it is likely to be more reliable in matters peripheral to the main heroic theme. We must view genealogies with caution - especially where the chauvinism of later generations is overt - but we may suppose names of places and of heroes to be innocent of contamination until proved guilty. There will be no precise absolute chronology, but we may reasonably look for a relative chronology of contingent events. In brief, distortion and interpolation exist; but purposeless distortion and unmotivated interpolation do not: in Modern Greek terms, Homer is *μυθιστοριογράφος*.

In using later sources we face different dangers. Distortion and bias are constantly present. We may, by *Quellenforschung* and attention to a writer's ambience and purpose, detect some of this. One important general point may, however, be made. Modern writers tend to see *μῦθος* and *λόγος* as different in character, and to suppose that there were two different types of attempt made by the Greeks to understand their own past, one intrinsically more trustworthy than the other; but this distinction is alien to ancient thinking. Inscriptions have a peculiar value, as a direct record without interpretation, but they are seldom very explicit.

In addition to the separate difficulties inherent in interpreting the sources there is a difficulty in piecing the evidence together. The evidence is cumulative in character, and conclusions depend on the sum of miscellaneous component parts. Also one must resist the temptation to tidy away all loose ends, as historical truth is rarely tidy.

Homer's Greeks are Danaoi, Argeioi or Achaioi. Danaoi is an ethnic term, the other two are geographical. These terms do not immediately rule out Dorians. Dorians had as much claim as - indeed rather more claim than - other Greeks to be of the ethnic stock of Danaos or Perseus. Homer's 'Pelagic Argos' is located in Thessaly, a region to which our quest for Dorians will take us over and over again. The place-name Argos occurs elsewhere; that most celebrated later was Dorian. Achaia too was a Dorian place-name.

As is well-known, Homer explicitly mentions Dorians only once, *Odyssey* 19.172-7, where they are included as an element in the mixed population of Crete (see Willetts, *Cretan cults*, 131-7). Features of particular interest are the presence of Pelasgoi in the same line, and the application of *τριχάϊκες* to Dorians. The same term is applied to the Dorians by Hesiod fr.233 M/W.

Diodoros 5.80.1-3 gives an extended account of the history of Cretan settlement. This is partly - but certainly not entirely - a piece of Homeric exegesis. In Diodoros' version there were firstly 'autochthonous' Eteokretans; these were joined by Pelasgoi *πλανήμενοι διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς στρατείας καὶ μεταναστάσεις*, and subsequently by Dorians under the leadership of Tektamos, son of Doros. Then came an unsettled period, with an influx of barbarians, the reign of Minos and finally, 'after the return of the Herakleidai', colonies from Argos and Lakadaimon. In another passage, 4.60.2, migrations of Pelasgoi and Dorians are conflated: Tektamos, son of Doros, came from Thessaly with Aiolians and Pelasgians and founded a new régime in Crete. Similarly Strabo 10.4.6, giving Andron of Halikarnassos (F10 Jacoby) as his source, reports that settlers came to Crete from Thessaly, from the country which in earlier times was called Doris, now called Histiaiotis. There are traces of the conflation in the existence of a Pelasgian Teutamides as well as a Dorian Tektamos in other sources, for which see Jacoby, *Kommentar, Nachträge* 1957: Hellanikos of Lesbos F4. Pelasgoi or Dorians, then, came, separately or together, from Thessaly to Crete, and this was before the reign of Minos.

Herodotos too saw Pelasgoi and Dorians as geographically close, located in Thessaly. Giving an account of early movements of population, 1.56-58, he comments that Pelasgoi *οἰκοῦντο ποτὲ ἴσαν τοῖσι νῦν Δωριεῦσι καλεσμένοισι* (*οἴκεον δὲ τῇ νῦν Θεσσαλίᾳ καλεσμένην*), 1.57.1. In the same passage, 1.56.3, he remarks that the ancestors of the Dorians were driven from the country known as Histiaiotis in the neighbourhood of Ossa and Olympus by the Kadmeans (cf. Thucydides 1.12.3). Herodotos proceeds to an ethnological theory of the kinship of Athenians with Ionians and Pelasgians; the evidence, including that which Herodotos himself presents, suggests that this was an artificial fabrication of later times (see J.A.R. Munro, 'Pelasgians and Ionians', *JHS* 54[1934], 109-128).

As Pelasgoi and Minyans belong together (see Thomson, *Studies... The prehistoric Aegean*², 374ff.), an association of Pelasgoi and Dorians implies an association of Minyans and Dorians. It may be noted that Thera had a tradition of Minyan as well as Dorian settlement. This may be seen as parallel to Crete's Pelasgoi and Dorians. These two regions of the Aegean had much in common.

But let us return to Homer. *Odyssey* 19 is the only explicit mention of Dorians. However, a Dorian presence in several regions of Greece is implied in *Iliad* 2, in the Catalogue of Ships. I have argued this elsewhere, in *The Dorian Aegean*, London 1980, 25-30 and

4. An article is in preparation on usage of the terms *μῦθος* and *λόγος*.

165-6, and need not recapitulate. But, briefly, the relevant considerations are: firstly, the characters in the myth, with their chronological and geographical setting; secondly, the three tribes and the number of ships. On the first consideration the Koan evidence is more clear-cut, on the second Rhodes is a clearer case.

The leaders of Kos, city of Eurypylos, are Pheidippos and Antiphos, sons of Thessalos, son of Herakles. The names given in the family tree and the name Eurypylos show connexions with Thessaly. These connexions are corroborated by other evidence, most of it indirect, but cumulatively making an incontrovertible case (see already W.R. Paton & E.L. Hicks, *The inscriptions of Cos*, Oxford 1891, 344-8, Appendix F, Connections of Cos with Southern Thessaly). Herakles' victory over Eurypylos and marriage with his daughter Chalkiope may be seen as a conquest by Herakles' followers over earlier settlers of Thessalian origin.

Rhodes is more complex. The ships are commanded by Tlepolemos, son of Herakles: Tlepolemos has fled into exile after accidentally killing his father's uncle Lykymnios; his place of origin is usually traced to the Peloponnese. But there are many traditions connecting Rhodes too with Thessaly, and it is arguable that there were again successive groups of settlers from the Greek mainland, the first from Thessaly (that associated with Phorbas, Triopas and Iphiklos) ousting Minoans, and the second associated with Herakles (see *The Dorian Aegean* 161-2, discussion of Diodorus 5.57.6 and Athenaeus 8.360e).

For the question of the tribes *Iliad* 2.653-6 and 668-70 are the relevant passages. Perhaps the phrase διὰ τρία κομηθέντες, 655, refers to the three cities of Rhodes, Lindos, Ialysos and Kameiros, named in the next line. But τριχθα δὲ ᾤκηθεν κατακυλαδόν, 668, is a clear reference to tribal grouping. A characteristic distinguishing feature of the Dorians was their tribal system, with the three tribes Hylleis, Dymanes and Pamphyloi. Further, the tribes were used as units of military organization throughout their history: there is evidence for this from many communities, including Sparta and Crete. Thus it is significant that the islands sent ships to Troy in multiples of three - nine from Rhodes, three from Syme and thirty from Kos with its satellite islands.

The Catalogue of Ships has Dorians lurking in other regions also. The question of the historicity of the Catalogue was debated in an early article by George Huxley ('Mycenaean decline and the Homeric Catalogue of Ships', *BICS* 3[1965], 19-30); he concluded, 27, that it 'represents Mycenaean history and chronology ... about 1240 B.C.'. In a later article ('Numbers in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships', *GRBS* 7[1966], 313-8), replying to Page's assault on the numbers given for the contingents of ships as 'reckless exaggerations' (*History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley 1972, 153), he argues persuasively for accuracy in the lists. Long ago Glotz suggested ('*Les Naucrares et les Prytanes des Naucrares*', *REG* 13[1900], 133-157: 'remanié' as *La marine et la cité de l'épopée à l'histoire*, Chapter V, pp.229-253, of *Études sociales et juridiques sur l'Antiquité grecque*, Paris 1906) that those communities which sent ships in multiples of three were Dorian and those which sent them in multiples of four Ionian. Glotz much weakened his own case firstly by taking the land of the Phaiacians as his starting point for an analysis of the social and military organization of the prehistoric Greek State (as there, if anywhere in Homer, we seem to be in the land of fairy-tale; or the most plausible identification, if such be attempted, is with Minoan Crete) and secondly by denying the historical value of the actual figures, seeing their significance merely as an indication of organization. Perhaps Glotz took his argument too far. I should not like to press the case where there are so many multiples of ten; also twelve is, of course, divisible by four or by three. But I am convinced that the numbers three, nine and thirty for the contingents from the Dodekanese stretch coincidence, and I want to make a case also for the kingdom of the Asklepiadaí and for Nestor's Pylos.

The realm of Asklepios' sons, Ἰητῆρ' ἄγαθῶ, ποδαιεῖριος ἡδὲ μαχάων, embraces Trikke, Ithome and Oichalie (*Iliad* 2.729-32). It sends thirty ships to Troy. 'The kingdom of the Asklepiadaí corresponds roughly to the later Histiaiotis', say Hope-Simpson and Lazenby, *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford 1970, 141. It will be remembered that it was from Histiaiotis that Andron brought the Cretan Dorians. The kingdom is next door to that of Eurypylos, whose connexions with Kos we have seen. The Asklepiadaí have connexions with Pylos as well as with Kos. After the fall of Troy Podaleirios was shipwrecked on the Karian coast (Pausanias 3.26.10). The bones of Machaon were taken to Messenia by Nestor and miracles of healing were performed at his grave there (Pausanias 4.3.10 & 30.3; cf. 3.26.9). Asklepios himself - so prominent on Kos - was worshipped in Messenia at a shrine said to have been founded from that at Thessalian Trikke (Strabo 8.4.4). The legends about Asklepios and the Asklepiadaí belong to a twin tradition linking Thessaly with Kos on the one hand and with Pylos on the other, a tradition relating to Mycenaean times. A variant, intensifying connexions with Thessaly, makes Machaon and Podaleirios sons of Poseidon (*Arkteinós Aithiops* fr. 3 Kinkel).

Before we turn to Pylos one passage of the Trojan Catalogue may be noted, *Iliad* 2.840-3. Troops of the Pelasgoi - φῶλα - are led by Hippothoos and Pylaíos. The usage of φῶλα here is unusual; the term is generally wider, as, e.g. *Odyssey* 3.282 φῶλ' ἀνθρώπων. But it is no coincidence that these troops, marshalled in tribes, are Pelasgoi with their nexus of associations with Dorians. The name Hippothoos suggests connexions with Thessaly, famed for its horses; in Pylaíos we may see a connexion with Eurypylos and with Pylos.

The Catalogue of Ships is prefaced by Nestor's advice to Agamemnon to marshal the troops

κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας, *Iliad* 2.362-3). It is possible that we have here a reference to the different organization of the Dorian allies (with φύλα) and the Ionian (with φρήτραι), as was argued by Glotz. Even Andrewes, who is strongly critical of Glotz's main line of argument (in his article 'Phratries in Homer', *Hermes* 89[1961], 129-140), concedes that there is more evidence for fratries from Ionian areas than from Dorian; he sees the lines as 'an intrusion from the life of Homer's own time: not an interpolation, since the lines are deeply rooted in their context, but ... a lapse from consistency' (p.132: similarly on the Pelasgian φύλα he remarks, p.140 n.1, that they 'might, but need not, be tribes in the classical sense'). Perhaps it is significant that the advice comes from Nestor, peculiarly accustomed to such organization of fighting men, as at *Iliad* 11.730, where fighting men from Pylos eat a meal κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν τελέεσσι. The general practice is attested in Herodotus 7.212.2, when the Greeks at Thermopylai κατὰ τάξεις τε καὶ κατὰ ἔθνηα κεκοσμημένοι ἦσαν.

Nestor is of the second generation of a Thessalian dynasty at Pylos; son of Neleus, who left Thessaly after a quarrel with his brother Pelias. Nestor's kingdom, which despatches ninety ships to Troy, is composed of nine townships: Pylos, Arene, Thryon, Aipu, Kyparisseis, Amphigeneia, Pteleon, Helos, Dorion (see Hope-Simpson & Lazenby, *Catalogue* 82-90: T.W. Allen, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*, Oxford 1921, 75-81: Ernst Meyer, 'Messenia', *RE Suppl.* XV[1978], 155-289, esp. 4a. *Vorgeschichte*).

The names Thryon, Aipu, Kyparisseis and Helos are descriptive of terrain, and occurrences elsewhere are accountable to similarity of terrain: it may be noted, however, that Kos had a Kyparissos, with worship of Apollo Kyparissios at the site later the Asklepieion, and also a cult of Hera with the unusual cult-title Heleia - Hera Argeia Heleia Basileia (Paton & Hicks, *Inscriptions* 38). Arene and Amphigeneia yield nothing of interest for our present purposes. Pteleon occurs as a place-name in Thessaly (*Iliad* 2.697). Dorion, variously regarded as a mountain or a plain (Strabo 8.3.25), may be related directly to the district Doris in Messenia (Hope-Simpson & Lazenby 85 with nn.29-31), and indirectly to the Thessalian Doris. As we have seen, tradition gave the Thessalian Doris as the place of origin of the Cretan Dorians. The same name, Doris, was given to the gulf of Kos (Ptolemy, *Geog.* 5.2.8; cf. P.M.Frazer & G.E.Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea*, Oxford 1954, 70 n.1). In the Catalogue, Dorion is the location of a picturesque incident: there the Muses met the Thracian Thamyris coming from Oichalie, the home of Eurytos, and took revenge on him for his presumptuous boasts to be a better singer than they, stripping him of his musical skills. According to the Catalogue this Oichalie was in Thessaly; whether or not there was a Messenian Oichalie also is debatable (Hope-Simpson & Lazenby 85 with n.33: on Euboian Oichalie see below p.98).

The question of the location of Nestor's Pylos has, from Strabo's time onwards (and perhaps even before) received more attention than it really deserved. Strabo's own remarks (8.3.7), citing the proverb ἔστι Πύλος πρὸ Πύλοιο. Πύλος γὰρ μὲν ἔστι καὶ ἄλλος, sum up the confusion over the topography: H.T.Wade-Gery, discussing the reconciliation of passages in Homer relating to Nestor's domain in *Iliad* 2, 7; 11 and 23 in 'The Dorian invasion: what happened in Pylos', *AJA* 52(1948), 115-8, comments on p.117 that 'our evidence is untidy because the facts were untidy'. Strabo viewed the Triphylian (and not the Messenian) Pylos as Nestor's home. The name Triphylia clearly indicates a place with social grouping in three tribes. Strabo relates this to Epeians, Minyans or Arkadians, and Eleians. The alternative suggests he was guessing. It may be noted that a community which had a three-way grouping would re-group in three when a change of settlement occurred, as in the case of a colony established by the Dorian Pamphyloi. In any case, Messene and Triphylia were close, with a cape common to both (Strabo 8.3.3 & 4.1-2).

The question of the relationship between Pylos and Sparta, between the kingdom of Nestor and that of Menelaos, is too complex to debate here. But in the *Iliad* Agamemnon promises to Achilles townships which seem to belong to Nestor's kingdom (9.150), and Strabo (8.4.1) states that the Neleidae seized Messenia after the death of Menelaos. Possibly part of Messenia was subject to Sparta: in communities where raiding of neighbours' territories is a way of life boundaries must be in constant dispute. Or it is possible that Strabo's chronology is confused, and the movement of the Neleidae to the region put too late.

Before leaving the Catalogue's list of places in Nestor's kingdom I ought perhaps to touch on the relationship between this list and places named in the Linear B tablets from Pylos. The coincidences are not startlingly close. The kingdom of the tablets is smaller in extent than that of the epic (see J.Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*², Cambridge 1973, 143). There are two groups of townships, one group nine and one seven in number. In Crete the relative size of the kingdom of the tablets from Knossos and that of the Homeric heroes is similar. It is in the nature of an heroic tradition to exaggerate the size and extent of kingdoms - to have a small number of powerful kings rather than a motley collection of barons. While a precise correspondence is not found, a correlation of names occurring in the Linear B tablets and in Homer reveals that the names cluster around certain localities and heroes: the most important cycles belong to Pylos, Thessaly and Crete (see D.H.F.Gray, 'Mycenaean names in Homer', *JHS* 78[1958], 43-48).

There is incidental information elsewhere in the epics about Nestor's kingdom, most of it given in anecdotal form by Nestor. We hear of cattle raids and border battles (*Iliad* 7.132-156 & 11.670-671), and about an expedition against Pylos led by Herakles (*Iliad* 11.689-693). The attack of Herakles was allegedly repulsed by Neleus. But Neleus lost eleven of his

twelve sons, the sole survivor being Nestor - does this sound like a victory? And Nestor survived because he was a young son, sent away from home to be brought up - does this sound like a winner's move? Rather, is it not plausible that part or all of the area was conquered by Herakles, that is by Dorians; and that we have repeated at Pylos the settlement pattern of Crete and the Dodekanese: Pelasgoi or Minyans from Thessaly succeeded by Dorians? This would not be an isolated case of an epic tradition turning a defeat into a victory. The account given by Pausanias, 2.18.7, of the justification put forward by the Herakleidai on taking Messenia is fully in accord with this interpretation: the claim of the Herakleidai to Messenia was partly dynastic, partly based on conquest: ... παραναπαθήτην Νέστορι δοθῆναι καὶ ταύτην ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους ἐλόντος Πύλον. It is tempting to suppose that the 'secondary dialect' (proto-Doric) of the Linear B tablets was brought by Herakles' followers; it would be a pleasing paradox to discover that the Dorians, so long regarded as the primitive destroyers of a sophisticated and superior culture, were themselves literate after all.

The stories of Herakles at Kos and at Pylos are 'doublets' (and with them may be linked the story of Herakles at Euboian Oichalia). Herakles' attack on Kos and marriage to Chalkiope, daughter of Eurypylos, son of Poseidon, parallels Herakles' attack on Pylos, held by Nestor, descendant of Poseidon. The union of Herakles with the mother of Tlepolemos, from Ephyra in Eleia, bordering on Messenia (*Iliad* 2.659 and Strabo 8.3.5), may belong to this second cycle, as Nestor had connexions with that region (*Iliad* 11.738). Similarly, Eurytos, king of Euboian Oichalia, was attacked by Herakles, who seized Eurytos' daughter Iole, subsequently married to Hyllos (Sophokles, *Trachiniai* passim). Another doublet story linking the regions is that of the Molionides twins, whose father was Poseidon and mother daughter of the Cretan Molos.

Herakles was a leader of roving bandits who conquered but could not control several regions of the Aegean world. Herakles has particular associations with Tiryns, belonging to a younger branch of the Perseid dynasty, related to Eurystheus (*Iliad* 19.105), and with Thebes. At Thebes he had a twin brother Iphiklos (Amphitryon being father of Iphiklos and Zeus of Herakles), a kind of *Doppelgänger* in certain myths. Thus at Rhodes a hero named Iphiklos led a 'Greek' attack against 'Phoenicians' (that is, Mycenaean against Minoan, see *The Dorian Aegean* 160-162): we may compare the story of Herakles' expedition to get the Cretan bull (Apollodorus 2.5.7).

Some direct and explicit information about Nestor's kingdom (which we should perhaps now call Herakles' kingdom, regarding Nestor as a puppet prince) comes in *Odyssey* 3, an account of a visit paid by Telemachos, seeking news of his father, to Nestor, safely returned from the Trojan War. Books 3 and 4 of the *Odyssey* have a peculiar interest as depictions of stable and real communities in peace-time. By contrast the *Iliad* shows us a war situation; in the *Odyssey* Ithaca is unstable and the land of the Phaiacians is - as noted above p.96 - less 'real'. In *Odyssey* 3 there are details of the social, civic and religious organization of the people of Pylos. The beginning of *Odyssey* 3 describes a sacrifice to Poseidon, the end a sacrifice to Athena. There are similarities between this ritual, practices relating to the cult of Zeus Polieus in Hellenistic Kos, and the Attic festival of the same god, the Bouphonia or Dipoleia.

At Pylos Telemachos finds the people gathered on the beach in nine ἔδραι, each comprising five hundred men. This figure for the male population is in agreement with the number on board the ninety ships which went to Troy: $90 \times 50 = 9 \times 500$, 4,500 men. There is presumably some connexion between the nine ἔδραι and the nine townships. ἔδρα cannot here be 'bench' (pace LSJ s.v.), but is surely a tribal division (see Thomson, *Studies... The prehistoric Aegean*², 361-362). Nestor's ἑταῖροι (3.32) are in groups like the tribal ἑταιρεία of later Crete. The people are gathered on the shore, ἐς Πυλίων ἀνδρῶν ἀγυρίν τε καὶ ἔδρας (3.31), not their usual meeting place.

Each ἔδρα provides nine bulls. Stanford, in his commentary (London 1964), comments 'The sacrifice here of 81 victims forms the largest mentioned by our poet'; but surely, rather, some selection procedure takes place: προύχοντο (3.8: προέχουμι literally = 'hold before oneself') may be translated 'offered', as in the perceptive discussion of the passage by Willetts (*Cretan cults* 97). The sacrifice is ἐκατόμβη (3.59; cf. ταύρους παμμέλανας plural, 3.6), but the actual business of it is quickly passed over (3.9). How many bulls, then, were actually sacrificed?

How many bulls would be required to feed 4,500 people? This practical question demands a practical answer, which I am much indebted to Mr Murray Mitchell, Butcher, of Market Street, St. Andrews, for obligingly supplying. The average Aberdeen-Angus heifer, as supplied at Stirling meat market, weighs in at 8 cwt., giving a carcase (all usable meat) of 521 lbs. A bull would weigh at least 10 cwt., giving some 650 lbs of good meat. There would also be 10-12 lbs liver and 12-14 lbs tripe. The liver is, in Pylian terms, σπάγχια (or ἔντερα, and we may compare the κοκκορέτσια of the modern Greek Easter, cooked and tasted separately): the kidney was probably roasted with the main meat. On the conventional dinner-party estimate of 4oz meat per person, 650 lbs would feed 2,600 people, and two animals would feed the populace. But if we allow 1 lb per person (in the absence of Yorkshire pudding and two veg.) we will need eight animals - nine to have some leeway, always allowed by the good hostess (and it is possible that wives and children shared in the feasting, though there is no indication of their presence). The estimate is rough and ready, but we may be sure that Homer's audience, regular participants in such occasions, would do their sums. Almost certainly, then, nine

bulls were sacrificed, one from each ἔδρα.

At the end of *Odyssey* 3 the sacrifice of a cow (βοῦς, feminine, 3.384) to Athena is described in elaborate detail. This is grafted on to the narrative skilfully enough. In astonished and delighted realization that Telemachos has had Athena as companion - as the goddess takes off in the form of a vulture - Nestor makes a vow of a sacrifice (3.383-4). Nestor's vow does not concern Telemachos and his mission, but the welfare of himself and his family. The transition back to the main action after the sacrifice is slightly less smooth: Telemachos is rather abruptly given a bath by Polycaste (3.465-9) and we return to the feasting.

The horns of the victim are gilded by a χαλκεύς or χρυσόχοος, Laerkes, whose name is significant, a doublet of δημιουργός with the components λαός and ἔργον. The participants in the sacrifice are Nestor and his six sons, who all have different roles to play. Stratios and Echephron bring the cow by the horns, Aretos brings up a bowl of lustral water in one hand and a basket of meal (σῶλας) in the other, Thrasymedes brings up the axe and deals the first blow, Perseus brings a bowl for the blood (bleeding from the neck takes five minutes or a little more, according to my informant, and the blood would be reserved to make a black pudding, as in Paton & Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos* 37.53), Nestor performs preliminaries to the rite and finally Peisistratos makes the sacrifice. The nature of the sacrifice and the language used suggest that we have here an ancient rite with Minoan affinities. While the sacrifice to Poseidon is described first, that to Athena is described in much more detail.

Perhaps there was an accommodation of the worship of a female deity to that of a male, a superimposition of the worship of Poseidon on a local ritual of 'Aegean' type by Neleus' settlers from Thessaly. With the fusion of population, god and goddess are worshipped together, the former given nominal precedence and quantitative superiority, but the latter with more elaborate ritual and qualitative supremacy. A similar accommodation, stopping short of full syncretism, may be seen elsewhere. For example, at Rhodes the Boukopion was situated on the lower slopes of the Lindian Acropolis, while worship of a female deity was maintained on top, and there syncretism did accompany the accommodation, Athana Lindia representing a combination of Greek (Dorian) Athana and pre-Greek Lindia. Homer's story of Telemachos' visit to Pylos may be seen as aetiology (in embryonic form): as a 'justification' of the Athena cult, alien but older.

An inscription from Hellenistic Kos - part of the elaborate codification of state ritual undertaken after the synoecism of 366 - lays down in great detail provisions for a sacrifice to Zeus Polieus, followed the same day by a sacrifice to Athana Polias. On the next day there are sacrifices to Zeus Machaneus and Athana Machanis, organized on similar lines⁵. Unfortunately the beginning of the inscription is largely illegible; but it is clear that λεροποιοί and heralds drive up nine oxen, each from an ἑνάτα (ninth) into the agora. The tribe of the Pamphyloi drives up its three finest beasts to see if one will be chosen; if not, the Hylleis drive up three; if still not, the Dymanes drive up three. If none of these nine contenders is selected (there being no indication of how this is decided), the whole procedure is repeated for a second and then, if necessary, for a third time. If still no victim is chosen, a similar procedure takes place with an animal taken from each χιλιαστός.

There are difficulties in disentangling the tribal nomenclature; in particular, the relationship between the tribal divisions ἑνάτα and χιλιαστός is not clear. An ἑνάτα is evidently a ninth of something and χιλιαστός, clearly at least notionally a body of 1,000, may be an alternative term for ἑνάτα or, as I believe, something different. S.M. Sherwin-White, following R. Herzog, sees ἑνάτα as a ninth of the state, that is a third of the tribe, and as equivalent to χιλιαστός (pp. 160 and 42-3 respectively of the works cited in n.5 below). But, while such a difference in nomenclature is theoretically possible, according to whether the unit is viewed as part of the tribe or as part of the state, the juxtaposition of the two terms in the inscription renders it unlikely. Francotte (*La polis grecque*, Paderborn 1907, p. 126) saw ἑνάτα as a ninth of the tribe and χιλιαστός as a third of the tribe; and this seems to me to fit the content of the inscription much better.

It is evident that twenty-seven oxen are available: three groups of nine may be produced: three finest from Pamphyloi plus three (sc. finest) from Hylleis plus three (sc. finest) from Dymanes; then three more from each tribe; then, for a third time, three more from each. From the fact that only nine are driven up in the first instance (the three finest from each tribe), and from the expression τοὺς [λοιποὺς] in line 14, it may be supposed that it was expected - and probably hoped - that selection would be speedy, as anyone who has seen nine bulls together in the streets of Pamplona will understand. The part of the χιλιαστός in the procedure is not clear. This group steps in if there is an impasse over selection. The verb ἐπικρίνονται implies that further potential victims are produced, rather than that the beasts from the ἑνάται are produced all over again (LSJ on ἐπι- in composition refers to the 'accumulation of one thing over or besides another'; cf. ἐλάντω and ἐπελάντω in lines 9 & 12; also the mingling of these τοῦς ἄλλοις (line 19). To sum up, there are twenty-seven ἑνάται, each

5. Paton & Hicks 37 = SIG³ 1025 = I. de Prott & L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e titulis collectae*, Leipzig 1896 & 1906, 5 = R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, *APrA*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 6 (1928), 6; see also M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, Leipzig 1906, 18-23; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* V, Oxford 1909, 349-50; S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, *Hypomnemata* 51 (1978), 158-61. Cf. Paton & Hicks 38-39.

with an ox to offer for sacrifice; and further animals are waiting in the wings for scrutiny if required.

A sacrifice is performed to Hestia by the γεραιώροτος βασιλεύων (line 22) if the animal bows its head (αἰ μέγ κα ὑποκύβει, line 21). This seems to be an optional concomitant to the sacrifice to Zeus; but one may suspect that the populace saw to it that the animal did bow its head, as most of the beef from this sacrifice fell to the citizens (line 24). In cult Hestia is often associated with Zeus, especially in his civic capacity. Heralds then take to the agora the animal chosen for sacrifice to Zeus (line 25); the victim is valued and payment made to Hestia (the state treasury; lines 26-29); there is much preliminary business (lines 29-42); the main celebrants are appointed for the sacrifice - one of the ἱεροποιοί nominated by the priest (lines 42-43) and a ἀραγεύς elected by the heralds from their number (lines 44-45). After the sacrifice, special cuts of meat are allocated to particular people or groups.

We have examined sacrifices to Poseidon and Athena in heroic Pylos and to Zeus and Athena in Hellenistic Kos. The divergence between Poseidon and Zeus is not significant; it is probable that these two important male gods were not differentiated in early Greek religion (see *The Dorian Aegean* 154-5). Hades too sometimes overlaps; here it may be mentioned that Pylos has been regarded as a gate to the underworld, and that Nestor's family had chthonian associations. κῆανοχαίτης (*Odyssey* 3.6) is understood by some as a reference to Poseidon's character as a god of the underworld, offered black victims. The nature of Greek ritual accounts for some of the similarities in these two sacrifices: the part played by heralds, the preliminary cooking of offal: the assumption in a democracy by state officials called βασιλεῖς of the role played by the βασιλεύς in the heroic age.

But the coincidence in numbers, with multiples of three related to tribal divisions, is striking. And the notional population of Kos is exactly double that of Pylos. It has been argued that a selection procedure operated at Pylos as it did at Kos. In both cases the sacrifice takes place in an unconventional setting, at a large public gathering in the open - ἀγυρίς or ἀγορά. Nestor is assisted by his six sons, the Koan priest is assisted by the ἱεροποιοί, probably six in number and possibly belonging to one family⁶. The system of multiple involvement in the rite, with different participants playing different clearly defined roles, and two involved in the slaughter, is similar. In both the bleeding of the victim is a prominent feature. And, probably, both involved setting meal before the animal: for in line 10 of the inscription restored φιλά[α]ν (Paton & Hicks) or στολ[α]ν (*SIG*³, suppl. Wilamowitz) ought, I suggest, to be restored rather οὐλ[α]ν, 'meal', a collective usage of the noun; but I shall return to this point.

The most striking feature of the inscription, in relation to the Homeric passage, is the presence of Nestoridai in the lists of recipients of γέρη, choice cuts of meat. This family receives γότου δίκρεας, sirloin (lines 54-55). The Nestoridai occur in one other Koan inscription referring to a family cult of Zeus Phratrios (Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze* 35n., *ined.*). Also in the list of recipients, in addition to the usual priests and acolytes, are λατροί and χαλκεῖς (line 55). These groups, with this particular involvement in the important state cult, are probably families, like the Nestoridai. The λατροί are readily identifiable as Asklepiadai (and we have seen the links of Asklepios' family with Thessaly, Pylos and Kos, above p.96). The χαλκεῖς may be a family with skills similar to those of the Pylian χαλκεύς, Laerkes. Heralds too are prominent, and for families pursuing the hereditary office of herald there is a ready parallel in the Spartan Talthybiadai.

The pattern of involvement of Coan families in state cults is repeated in the provisions for sacrifice (on the following day) to Zeus Machaneus. Here special privileges fall to the Phyleomachidai (lines 18-19). Phyleomache was wife of Pelias, brother of Neleus, and this takes us right back to Thessaly. Long ago Paton noticed the pattern (Paton & Hicks p. 348 on 37 & 38), and was puzzled by it: 'The names of these two kindred families ... both stamp them as non-Dorian, and connect them with the very region to which other Thessalian survivals in Cos have been traced back. We might conjecture that they, along with other noble Thessalian houses, were enrolled in the tribe of the Pamphyli by the Dorian conquerors of Cos, but we cannot, on this hypothesis, explain the fact that they have unique privileges in the cultus of Zeus Polieus and Zeus Machaneus ...'. The answer to Paton's problem is that the theory of 'Dorian conquerors' of non-Thessalian stock is mistaken.

There are some similarities between the ritual at Kos and the ritual of the Bouphonia or Dipoleia at Athens (*IG* I¹.843; see Farnell, *Cults I*, Oxford 1896, 56-8, and H.W.Parke, *Festivals of Athens*, London 1977, 162-7 & 200, nn.212-217). There the ox for sacrifice to Zeus was apparently selected in advance, but had to give a sign that it was ready or suitable for the rite by eating some grain from a sacred table. That, in conjunction with *Odyssey* 3.441, leads me to restore οὐλ[α]ν in our inscription. On the name Bouphonia, Parke remarks (p.162) that the same word is used for killing the animal as would ordinarily have been used for the killing of a man. With this may be compared the Koan term ἀραγεύς (line 45), which generally connotes 'murderer', as at Euripides *IT* 623 and Demosthenes 13.32,

6. For a group of six ἱεροποιοί plus priest see Paton & Hicks 370 & 388. For nine with priest see Paton & Hicks 406; and at Kameiros there were twelve with priestly δαμιοργός. On 'interlocking family ties' of ἱεροποιοί see Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, 218.

although *απαρχή*, abs., *απαρχιον*, of the victim, and the verb *απαρχίζω* are all used in sacrificial contexts. The corporate nature of the ritual, with one attendant slitting the victim's throat and another wielding the axe, is prominent, and at Athens specifically related to shared responsibility or guilt. In brief, the atmosphere of the sacrifice is the same, but the organization is very different.

There was a strong tradition that Nestor's family took refuge in Athens when Pylos was destroyed (most recently discussed by C.Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Movement of populations in Attica at the end of the Mycenaean period', in R.A.Crossland & A.Birchall, edd., *Bronze Age migrations in the Aegean*, London 1973, 215-225), and there are vestiges of this in a cult of Kodros, Neleus and Basile at a shrine Neleion (see *ABSA* 55[1960], 60, and *JHS* 80[1960], 115). Subsequently, it was told, the Nestoridai were leaders of settlers from the Greek mainland to the coast of Asia Minor, in the so-called 'Ionian migration'. This was rather a motley group, as stated by Herodotos (1.146) and now argued by (among others), M.B.Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie*, Athens 1958. The tradition shows clear signs of Athenian invention and manipulation.

It might be tempting to see the cult practices discussed as passing from Pylos to Kos via Athens. This would be particularly attractive if a suggestion of Herzog (*Heilige Gesetze* 5) that the priesthood of Zeus Polieus at Kos was hereditary in the family of the Hippiadai could be trusted; but it cannot. Or we might think of secondary transmission from the Asia Minor region. Miletos was a town with traditions of Neleian settlement, and there were certainly constitutional links between Miletos and Kalymnos, just north of Kos, as well as intellectual contacts between Miletos and Kos itself. The route would then be Pylos to Kos via Miletos. Or again we might think of practices brought to Kos by Greek settlers who never returned to the mainland after the Trojan War: there are the traditions of Podaleirios already mentioned (above p.97); and also of members of Menelaos' and Agamemnon's crews who stopped in the region (see *The Dorian Aegean*, 154-5). In this case the Koan family Nostidai might be brought into consideration (cf. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Kos* 167). The route would be Pylos to Kos via Troy.

However, it seems to me rather that the Koan practices would be seen in direct relation to those of Pylos, despite the great gulf in time and place, with in both communities a movement from Thessaly as the originating impulse. The route is Thessaly to Kos and Thessaly to Pylos. And it can be said with certainty that families were very important in the transmission of cult practices: their part in effecting cult continuity through the Dark Ages has been ably demonstrated by Dietrich (*The origins of Greek religion*, Berlin & New York 1974). And that in Dorian communities the family was meshed in a tribal framework: later reorganization there might be, as at Chios (see W.G.Forrest, 'the tribal organization of Chios', *ABSA* 55[1960], 172-189), but such families as the Nestoridai never lost their importance.

I have argued that Homer's Dorians may be seen at Crete, in the Dodekanese, in Thessaly (a place of origin) and at Pylos. Critical characteristics are associations with Poseidon and Asklepios (friendly) and with Herakles (ambivalent); also a tripartite social structure of tribal character. I have not said much about subsequent events: about the 'Return of the Herakleidai', the widespread destructions and the 'whodunnit' question. I conclude with a brief consideration of these matters.

Myths are about families, and especially about family feuds. In myth - as indeed in real life - a character is more likely to be plundered or murdered by a relative than by a stranger. The destructions were particularly severe at Pylos and in the other mainland regions with which, I have argued, Dorians were associated. 'Returns' in Greek myth tend to be sinister: we have the return of Orestes, or the return of Polyneikes as salient examples. Polyneikes move from south to north against his own family and country may be seen as analogous to the move in the opposite direction of the Herakleidai: a retaliatory move against Eurystheus and a concomitant resolve to consolidate previous conquests in the region. Incidental parallels may be seen in the deaths of Hyllos (Pausanias 8.5.1; Diodorus 4.58.1-5) and Eteokles, in both cases an *Opfertod* to save the state; also in the motif of the brothers' quarrel, of Pelias and Neleus as of Eteokles and Polyneikes. The Herakleidai were assisted by the Aigeidai, sons of Aigeus - a by-name of Poseidon, Thessalian god par excellence. The same persistent nexus of connexions recurs at this phase in the myth.

The part of Athens in such myths is secondary. She steps in to provide a refuge for persecuted individuals or displaced peoples. In attempting to arrogate to herself a share in the heroic past Athens chose a role totally anachronistic and irrelevant to the real social conditions of the Bronze Age.

The Herakleidai, and the Dorians of the Late Bronze Age, may have been aggressive and quarrelsome cousins, but they were most emphatically members of the Greek (or Mycenaean or Achaian) family.

Review: A.J..WOODMAN(Leeds)

E.J.Kenney & W.V.Clausen (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature; II, Latin Literature*, Cambridge, University Press, 1982. Pp.xviii + 974. £40.00. ISBN 0 521 21043 7

Since I do not propose to comment on this book chapter by chapter, but instead to deal with selected aspects, it will perhaps be helpful if I begin with a full description. The major portion of the volume (pp.3-795) consists of a literary history of Rome from the beginnings to the fall of the city. It is divided into seven parts, each of which is, as a general rule, subdivided into several chapters (numbered consecutively throughout). The chapters are written by a variety of scholars, each of whom enjoys an international reputation. The plan of the History is as follows:

- I. Readers and Critics (48pp.): 'Books and readers in the Roman world' (E.J.Kenney); 'Literary criticism' (M.Winterbottom).
- II. Early Republic (119pp.): 'The genesis of poetry in Rome' (G.Williams); 'Ennius' *Annales*'; 'Drama'; 'Prose literature'; 'The satires of Ennius and Lucilius' (all A.S.Gratwick).
- III. Late Republic (120pp.): 'Predecessors' (E.J.Kenney); 'The new direction in poetry' (W.V.Clausen); 'Lucretius' (A.Dalzell); 'Cicero and the relationship of oratory to literature' (L.P.Wilkinson); 'Sallust' (F.R.D.Goodyear); 'Caesar' (R.M.Ogilvie); 'Prose and Mime' (N.Horsfall).
- IV. The Age of Augustus (198pp.): 'Uncertainties' (E.J.Kenney); 'Theocritus and Virgil' (W.V.Clausen); 'The *Georgics*' (L.P.Wilkinson); 'The *Aeneid*' (R.D.Williams); 'Horace' (N.Rudd); 'Love elegy' (G.Luck); 'Ovid' (E.J.Kenney); 'Livy' (R.M.Ogilvie); 'Minor figures' (J.C.Bramble).
- V. Early Principate (184pp.): 'Challenge and response' (D.W.T.C.Vessey); 'Persius' (N.Rudd); 'The younger Seneca' (C.J.Herington); 'Lucan' (J.C.Bramble); 'Flavian epic' (D.W.T.C.Vessey); 'Martial and Juvenal' (J.C.Bramble); 'Minor poetry'; 'Prose satire'; 'History and biography'; 'Technical writing'; 'Rhetoric and scholarship' (all F.R.D.Goodyear).
- VI. Later Principate (104pp.): 'Introductory'; 'Poetry'; 'Biography'; 'History'; 'Oratory and epistolography'; 'Learning and the past'; 'Minor figures' (all R.Browning); 'Apuleius' (P.G.Walsh).
- VII. Epilogue (7pp.; P.G.Walsh).

The remainder of the volume (pp.799-935) consists of an Appendix of Authors and Works which contains biographical and bibliographical material on the authors discussed. The book concludes (pp.936-974) with a metrical appendix, list of modern works cited in the text (interestingly selective), and an index (ancient authors not invariably entered under their *gentilicium*). But these three items lie beyond the scope of my discussion.

1. METHODOLOGY

When the volume was commissioned, as far back as 1971, Cambridge University Press issued a booklet of notes for contributors in which the following statements appeared:

The aim is to provide a conspectus of present knowledge which will stand as an unbiased and authoritative work of reference ... In the last 25 years great advances have been made in all fields of classical scholarship. In literary studies these advances have come about both through the acquisition of new knowledge and through more sophisticated approaches to literary criticism ... The History will make the results of these developments available to the widest possible public of scholars, students and other enquirers ... The principal aim is to summarise present knowledge ... The imagined reader is a person of the same intelligence as the writer, but without specialised knowledge ... [The History] is not intended as a textbook, rather as a work of reference ... Contributors might imagine that they are writing for specialists in some other literature or for graduate students in their own field ... The History aims at being both informative and critical, and a careful balance must be struck between the two types of discussion ... This kind of publication ... will automatically be required reading by all scholars in the subject.

There are two areas of potential conflict in this brief: between merely purveying existing knowledge and adopting a critical approach, and between writing a reference work for the non-specialist and producing required reading for scholars. Yet the emphasis seems to be on purveying knowledge for the non-specialist (see the sentence I have underlined), which I take to be confirmed by the fact that the editors have not objected to a footnote in which one contributor, faithful to his instructions, felt obliged to say that *virtus* is untranslatable into English (p.643 n.1; cf. also 202 n.1 & 206 n.1). To judge from their contributions (e.g. those on Caesar and Livy), other contributors interpreted their task in a similarly basic way, and the majority of such contributions are worthy but dull. They read, as I have heard more than one person remark, like extended entries in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. The notion that they could 'automatically be required reading by all scholars in the subject' is simply whistling in the dark.

Interestingly, however, the editors themselves, when wearing their contributors' hats, seems to have interpreted their task rather differently. Clausen attempts literary critiques of Catullus' poems and Virgil's *Eclogues*, while Kenney offers a revaluation of Ovid's exile poetry based closely on literary analysis. Other contributors too (notably Rudd and Bramble), no doubt taking their cue from the single sentence in the contributors' notes where it is said that 'the History aims at being both informative and critical ...', have produced essays in

which the emphasis is on criticism. Perhaps it is in response to just such contributions that the programmatic statements contained in the actual volume are, I think, significantly different from the instructions issued more than a decade earlier. On the dust-jacket blurb we read: [The History] provides a comprehensive, critical survey of the literature of ... Rome ... It embodies the very considerable advances made by recent classical scholarship, and reflects too the increasing sophistication and vigour of critical work on ancient literature. And in the preface (p.xiii): [The History] is intended to make available .. the results of recent and current scholarship ... Its emphasis is critical ... Contributors [have been] free to concentrate on discussion of the literary texts themselves. Whereas in 1971 the primary task was seen as purveying knowledge, with criticism of secondary importance, in 1982 the roles are reversed: criticism now seems to have assumed primary importance (see the sentence I have underlined), while purveying knowledge is a secondary consideration.

Now contributions such as those by Clausen and Bramble can certainly be described as 'critical'; but to be fully appreciated and properly judged they require to be read by fellow specialists, as we shall see later. Conversely, the promise of a critical approach raises expectations which naturally cannot be fulfilled by those contributors who have interpreted their task differently. The scholarly reader who takes the preface at face value will be sadly disappointed by much of the volume.

Thus the contradictions of the original instructions have worked their inevitable way through to the finished volume, and what we are given, in the main, is two utterly different types of contributions: that for the non-specialist from which the scholar will derive little or no profit, and that which indulges in criticism but is appropriate to few except scholars. Only in a small number of cases are these contradictions resolved. One of these is the discussion of Ovid by Professor Kenney himself, who combines elegance with authority and argument with illustration (his section on the *Metamorphoses*, especially pp.440-441, is particularly good). Being also the senior Editor of the volume as a whole, Professor Kenney was close to its production and was able to interpret the true intention which lay behind the instructions; and in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and exile poetry he was additionally fortunate to have subjects which invite argument.

Before I leave the question of methodology there are two further issues I should mention. Both of them concern the 'non-specialist' approach. First, this approach assumes *ex hypothesi* that the reader's knowledge is severely limited, which means that he will need all the help he can get. Yet contributors were advised to keep annotation to a minimum, which means that we are not told where Cicero praised Caesar's commentaries (p.240) or where the long fragment of Pollio can be found (p.492) or where Seneca discussed Arruntius (*ibid.*); nor will non-specialist readers make much of unexplained references to Asianism and Atticism (pp.478 and 492), or such statements as '[Caesar] had ... great affection for Curio' (p.285). Such lack of documentation is, I think, a recurrent feature and is all the more surprising in view of the fact that the main text of the History contains a number of technical excursions: on the sense of *liber* and of *cornua* (pp.30-31), on the titling of books (pp.31-32), on the nature and art of Latin quantitative verse (pp.86-93), on the end of Virgil *Georgic* 4 (pp.329-331), and on the *Octavia* (pp.530-532). Such matters are of concern mainly to scholars and would have been better treated in a series of appendices. Thus the promise of the blurb, that 'technical annotation is ... kept to a minimum', is true only in the sense that readers are often not provided with the references they will actually need.

Second, I ought in fairness to say that some of the non-specialist contributions are worth reading, though not always for the same reasons. F.R.D.Goodyear's are enlivened by Tacitean *sententiae* and a ready wit, creating the impression that he enjoyed his allotted authors (or not, as the case may be); 'Few Latin poems so completely fail to involve the reader (p. 630, of the *Aetna*); 'No Latin writer excites more lively interest', 'for unaffected ease and raciness many passages ... are quite unsurpassed' (pp.635 & 638, of Petronius); 'Cicero never had a better imitator' (p.646, of Tacitus in *Dialogus*); 'Egotism and consular rank are no safeguards against credulity or error' (p.648, of Tacitus in *Historiae*); 'If there is a virtue in being without vices, Pliny in his letters may fairly lay claim to it' (p.658); 'It is hard to find another Latin writer so utterly empty-headed' (p.665, of Florus). L.P.Wilkinson too writes with a real feeling for Cicero (his sections on the verse and letters are particularly successful), and, as is to be expected of the author of *Golden Latin Artistry*, he has rightly endeavoured to give readers an impression of Cicero's language and style. Whatever problems may surround Cicero, they concern the man rather than his writings: hence the numerous biographical studies which have appeared in English over the past few years (none of them, by the way, mentioned in the bibliographical Appendix). This is not the case with Virgil and the *Aeneid*. In the past the poem was regarded as an imperialist hymn, but with the political disillusionment of the 1960s scholars tended to argue, especially in America, that Virgil cannot have approved of the totalitarian Augustan régime and that his epic must in reality be an anti-establishment tract. Nowadays two views of the *Aeneid* are current. According to one (the 'full circle' view), the old imperialist interpretation was right but for the wrong reasons: Virgil glorified the régime, not necessarily because he approved of it, but because he had no option and was anyway obeying the rules of the epic genre. According to the other (the '*via media*' view), Virgil had an ambivalent attitude towards contemporary society and this attitude is inevitably reflected in the *Aeneid* since poetry is essentially

an ambiguous medium. R.D. Williams thus has the advantage over Mr Wilkinson (whose essay his own otherwise resembles in excellence and general approach) in having a controversy to tackle and an interpretation to put forward. Quite rightly he comes down firmly in favour of the ambiguity of the *Aeneid* (see especially pp. 352-3, 356-7 & 368-9).

2. PROPORTION

It will be seen from the plan of the History, outlined above, that hardly more space is given to the late Republic (Catullus, Lucretius, Cicero, Sallust and Caesar) than to the preceding period. This strikes me as curious, but other relative emphases in the volume are no less surprising, at least if page-totals are anything to go by. Consider these statistics: Ennius 21½; Plautus 20½; Terence 11; Lucilius 9; Catullus c.28; Lucretius 23; Cicero 37; Sallust 12; Caesar 5; Varro 4+; Cornelius Nepos 2½; Virgil 69; Horace 35; Tibullus 2; Propertius 2½; Ovid 2½ + 38½ = 41; Livy 8; *Appendix Vergiliana* 7; Manilius 3; Persius 8; the younger Seneca 22; Lucan 25; Statius 19; Valerius Flaccus 10; Silius Italicus 6; Martial + Juvenal 26; *Apocolocyntosis* 2; Petronius 4; Tacitus 13; the younger Pliny 5+; Suetonius 3; Florus 2; the elder Pliny 2; Quintilian 2; Fronto 2; Gellius 2; Apuleius 12½. When considering how much emphasis to give an author, one must naturally take into account the extent and character of his oeuvre, his intrinsic importance, and his influence on subsequent literature. Virgil scores highly on all counts and is rightly given the appropriate treatment. But I cannot help feeling that some of the volume's other emphases are questionable, while others are downright misleading. Is Tibullus no more important than Florus? Cornelius Nepos than the love-elegy of Propertius and Ovid? Indeed G. Luck's discussion of love-elegy is an extreme example of the disproportion of the volume and I am very surprised that the editors accepted his contribution as it stands. Again, are the elder Pliny and Quintilian so insignificant? The former, as it happens, is specifically mentioned in the notes with which contributors were issued: 'Books having literary pretensions without literary merit (e.g. Pliny's *Natural history*) will be relevant to the general character of a period'. But surely this rubric does not also apply to Quintilian, especially since the notes also advise that 'to qualify for detailed description or critical analysis a book ... must be itself a work of literature, or have been demonstrably influential on literature (e.g. Aristotle's *Poetics*)'. According to the *OCD* Quintilian 'profoundly influenced mediaeval and Renaissance writers', and the present History agrees that he 'exercised vast influence on critics and teachers of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries' (p. 676). Readers will no doubt question some of the other relative emphases in the volume, further instances of which I shall provide in the next section.

3. ARRANGEMENT AND SCOPE

Though Part II of the History (early Republic) is disproportionately long, as we have just seen, it is nevertheless the most successful of the seven parts of the book. The reason is that a single, well-chosen contributor was given the task of applying his expertise to a whole period. (It may also be significant that Dr Gratwick is a younger scholar and hence, perhaps, not impervious to the scholarly developments of recent years of which so much is made in the blurb and preface but which are not always quite so evident in the volume itself.) It is a pity that a similar procedure was not adopted for other periods too, but I suppose the editors considered each other period to be too diverse for adequate treatment by a single scholar. It is, it is true, adopted for the later Principate: but the literary history of that period was given to a scholar whose interests are not, I think, primarily literary. Yet the volume goes to the other extreme. Eleven different contributors are used in Parts III and IV, and two more are added in Part V.

Nor is there any uniformity of presentation. Some authors are given separate chapters (e.g. Sallust and Caesar); others are grouped by genre (e.g. Velleius, Curtius, Tacitus, Suetonius and Florus under 'History and biography', into which the younger Pliny is also strangely forced); others are split between chapters (e.g. Ovid under love elegy and in his own right); others still are grouped together on account of their unimportance (e.g. Phaedrus and Calpurnius Siculus under 'Minor poetry'). It is true that despite these inconsistencies the volume follows 'a broadly chronological framework' (p. xiii). Yet even that is abandoned by the placing of Apuleius last of all in the volume, after such authors as Vegetius, Sidonius and Merobaudes. This 'intrusive anomaly', we are told by way of explanation (p. xiii), 'represents an aesthetic rather than a historical decision on the part of the Editor'. But this frivolous appeal to aesthetics, by calling into question the whole principle on which the book is based, will simply encourage readers not to take the History seriously.

The variegated character of the volume, as I have just described it, has several unfortunate consequences. The first is that contributors find it difficult to place themselves on the wavelength of a book which, in the nature of the case, they have not seen or helped to shape. They lack a wider framework with which to integrate their discussion. A good illustration of this is afforded by comparing the two chapters of which Part I is comprised. The first is 'Books and readers in the Roman world'. Being also the Editor, Professor Kenney knew exactly what he wanted to write and how it would fit into the book as he envisaged it; and indeed we can see from the notes issued to contributors that such a chapter was contemplated, and thought of as important, from the moment the book was conceived. The chapter - which covers such issues as education, books and publication, and scholarship and criticism - is excellent and well deserves the description 'important' which the blurb gives to it, although some aspects of the subject, notably those concerning Roman books and their production, have become fashionable

since the chapter was written. The second chapter, on the other hand, while dealing with a subject at least as important ('Literary criticism'), seems to me to be out on a limb. Dr Winterbottom, whose credentials in this area are of course impeccable, seems to have lacked a focal point for his discussion. When I had finished reading his remarks, I wondered whether the subject might not have been treated more satisfactorily at the very end of the volume, incorporated into a retrospective analysis of the topics and authors studied, and directed to such questions as: 'These Latin authors are different both from their Greek predecessors and their European inheritors - what were their aims? what did literature mean to them? and were they thought by their critics to have been successful?' It is impossible to tell, of course, but such a procedure might have provided the wider framework which I feel the discussion requires.

Second, we are told in the blurb that 'the literature is presented throughout in the context of the culture and the social and historical processes of which it is an integral part'. Yet a plurality of contributors, each presumably anxious not to repeat simple historical facts which he assumed others will have mentioned, is almost guaranteed to produce the antithesis of a contextual account. To be sure, precautions have been taken: each part of the volume is introduced by a few brief pages which attempt to set the character of the following period (thus 'Uncertainties' for the Augustan age and 'Challenge and response' for the early Principate). But the practice of dividing up (say) the Augustan age into authors and topics and distributing them among various scholars, however, distinguished, will counteract these precautions, and readers will fail to catch the flavour of the period. We cannot see the wood for the trees.

There is a secondary consideration to be mentioned. To return again to a key sentence of the preface (p.xiii); '[The volume's] emphasis is critical: material relating to biography [and] chronology ... is presented for the most part in the Appendix of Authors and Works at the end of the volume, leaving contributors free to concentrate on discussion of the literary texts themselves'. This procedure was no doubt designed to avoid the tedious repetition of some types of information and was perhaps also influenced by the so-called 'biographical fallacy'; yet I detect a conflict between that statement in the preface and the promise of the blurb which I quoted in the previous paragraph and which again goes back to the notes issued to contributors ('Literature should be discussed as part of the culture to which it belonged, and social and historical factors should receive full attention').

Third, the choice of a plurality of contributors means that some surprising items can slip through the net. Despite the loss of most of his writing, we know a great deal about Asinius Pollio as politician, literary patron and author. Not surprisingly he has his own entry, comprising 5½ pages of discussion and extended bibliography in a section devoted to literary patrons, in the fourth edition of Schanz-Hosius' *Literaturgeschichte*, which appeared in 1935. Since that date scholars have come to appreciate Pollio's significance still further, not least because his lost histories were re-written by Sir Ronald Syme and published under a new title in 1939. Pollio's bibliography has increased accordingly over the same period: one could mention, for example, the monograph by André (1949), a dissertation by Haller (1967), and stylistic and political studies by Lebek (1970) and Bosworth (1972) respectively. Yet Pollio is not thought to merit his own entry in the new History. There are merely incidental references in various places, in one of which it is stated as a fact, which it most certainly is not, that *Eclogue 8* does not allude to Pollio (p.309). Nor does Pollio have an entry in the bibliographical Appendix.

This treatment seems to me incredible. Even if one were to argue that the loss of Pollio's writings disqualifies him from extended discussion in a volume where the 'emphasis is critical' (though even this I would dispute, since we know so much about the type of history which Pollio wrote), he should surely have been given scope under the heading of 'culture and the social and historical processes' to which the blurb refers. But try looking up 'patronage' in the index. There is no entry (though there are 1½ pages devoted to the topic in Kenney's chapter on 'Books and readers', although Pollio is not mentioned). Pollio is not the only author to suffer. Valerius Maximus gets half a page (pp.501-2) and no bibliography, and the elder Seneca another half page (p.513). Yet the latter was recently thought fit to be the subject of two good and substantial books.

Very few of the above shortcomings would have occurred if the number of contributors had been severely reduced. Though the task might have been beyond the scope of a single scholar, it is not impossible to think of a couple of scholars who between them could have written an excellent literary history of the late-Republican and Augustan periods. And the smaller the number involved, the easier will communication be between them. It will of course be argued that the desire was to get the real experts (Wilkinson on the *Georgics*, Williams on the *Aeneid*), and this advantage must naturally be balanced against the success with which Gratwick tackles a whole period despite being, as he would himself admit, less familiar with some aspects of it than others. But it is always easy to be wise after the event.

4. THE CRITICAL APPROACH

I have already indicated that some contributors saw their role as one of literary criticism, and it is to these that I now wish to turn. W.V.Clausen's first chapter, 'The new direction in poetry', is divided into four sections: The new poets and their antecedents; the marriage of Peleus and Thetis; *Catulli Veronensis Liber*; Lesbia, Sirmio, Calvus (this last consisting

of brief appreciations of Catullus 51, 58, 36, 31, 85, 109 and 50). Now Professor Clausen is a respected scholar who has worked in this field for many years: he is, for example, the author of a basic article on Callimachus and Latin poetry which appeared in 1964. Yet in the present volume he writes in a pretentiously whimsical style which suggests to me either that he is incapable of taking literary criticism seriously or that he is out of touch with Catullus' poetry and the approaches to it. He is preoccupied with form at the expense of content. I think it is significant that by far the best of his four sections is that in which he speculates on the original form of Catullus' *liber*, a quintessentially traditional subject to which he, as a traditional scholar, has been able to bring new insights. The difference in quality (as I see it) between this and his more literary sections reflects a divorce between 'scholarship' and 'literary criticism' which has vitiated the study of classical texts for many years. The divorce is in itself tragic; it is a pity that it should surface in a volume which is intended to enshrine a critical approach to Latin literature for many years to come.

Yet even to his discussion of Catullus' *liber* I have an objection. While I have already said that I approve of those contributors who have been able to present their essays in the form of an argument (Kenney, R.D. Williams), Clausen has here presented his (admittedly attractive) speculations as if they were fact. Indeed, by the time we reach p.309 they have become fact: 'Virgil was not the first Latin poet to arrange his own poems for publication: Catullus had already done so' (my underlining). Such an approach is out of keeping in a volume of this type and was specifically warned against in the notes with which contributors, including no doubt the Advisory Editor, were issued ('Contributors are invited to give an opinion on [contentious matters], provided they make it clear that this is what they are doing'). Clausen's speculations would have been better left in the learned journal in which they originally appeared in 1976. Their reappearance here 'in a somewhat revised form' is inappropriate in itself and gives to this section of the volume a second-hand quality.

Now to details. P.182: it is not made clear that πολυμυθον is a rare variant in the actual text of *Odyssey* 1.1, nor am I convinced that Callimachus *Aetia* 67.3 is a learned allusion to it. P.183: I cannot believe that Hesiod believed that he actually encountered the Muses on Helicon, even if 'strange things happen to shepherds by day in lonely places'. P.188: 'It may be that Catullus constructed [a plan of poem 64] for his own guidance while writing'. P.194: I am not convinced that Cornelius Nepos 'did not care for the *contores Euphorionis*' or that because he wrote risqué and amateur verse he was a 'fit recipient ... of a small book of short poems [viz. 1-50] ... in which there was little or nothing overtly neoteric'. I much prefer the view that Catullus wittily regarded Nepos' history in neoteric terms; and if Catullus' opening poems contain 'little or nothing overtly neoteric' then I do not know what 'neoteric' means. P.196: '55 reads like a failed metrical experiment; 58b must be unfinished'. But not if you join the two together, as did G.P. Goold, here unmentioned, in 1973. P.198: Sappho 31 and Catullus 51 do not make sense if interpreted as poems of jealousy, though modern scholars persist in so interpreting them, as here. P.198 n.1: how do we know that 'Catullus had not read through the *opera omnia* of Sappho'? P.199: is *lumina nocte* (51.12) a 'premature success that Catullus cannot have intended'? P.201: T.P. Wiseman's views of 36.12-15, though of course extremely attractive, should not be presented as biographical fact. P.203: has 'too much ... been made of *exorcior*' at 85.2?

As to Professor Clausen's second chapter ('Virgil and Theocritus'), I here mention only a few details. P.306: scholarly readers will be surprised to learn that comparatively little has been written on the *Eclogues*. 'The reason is the *Aeneid* ... (If only it might be given to read the *Eclogues* in perfect innocence of the *Aeneid* ...) A few perceptive comments have been made ... , not by a professional scholar but by a professional poet, Paul Valéry'. P.307: 'Verse 24 [of *Eclogue* 2] - over which grown men have puzzled their brains - is beautiful nonsense of the most precious Alexandrian sort'. P.308: 'On a note of irresolution this soft impeachment [of *Eclogues* 2] may well conclude'. The allusion to Sheridan, while in some respects apposite in an essay on the *Eclogues*, again betrays a concern for form over content. P.309: 'It has recently been demonstrated ... , on historical grounds, that the reference in the eighth *Ecl.* is not to Pollio but to Octavian, not therefore to the year 39 but to the year 35'. It is quite incredible that such a controversial statement, to which I have already drawn attention above, should appear in this form in what is intended to be a standard work of reference. Line 10 of *Eclogue* 8 is incompatible with Octavian, and Pollio's connexion with campaigns in Illyricum in 39 is well established. P.313: 'The marvellous fact of the book of the *Eclogues* defies explanation'. P.314: the hiatus of thought at *Eclogue* 1.18-19 is explained away with the statement that 'Virgil's poetic tact is here most politic'. P.314 n.3: since one section of *Eclogue* 1 does not produce a line-total which squares with the rest, Clausen says that this is 'a slight variation characteristic of Virgil's mature style'. The style of the poet of the *Aeneid*, no doubt.

Professor Rudd's assessment of Horace is a far happier contribution. He takes two themes, of which the first is the traditional view which most people have of Horace: 'cheerful, well adjusted, loyal, without any strong beliefs or emotions, the personification of *mediocritas*' (p.370). In roughly a dozen pages Rudd subjects this stereotype to a critical analysis from various angles and show the extent to which it requires modification. My only complaint concerns the brief remarks on random passages with which this part of his contribution concludes (pp.382-5) and which are really too superficial to be effective. Rudd's second critique is of

'the academic dichotomy', by which he means the various contrasting features which academics have detected in Horace's poetry: 'urban/rural, Stoic/Epicurean, grand/plain', and particularly the 'public/private' dichotomy. This section seems to me even better than the first. Rudd concludes that 'when allowance has been made for ... a range of inconsistency to which anyone is entitled, there remains a large central area in Horace's work where the main strands criss-cross. The dichotomy outlined above is therefore artificial and gives little help towards a just appreciation of his work'. Rudd believes that *Odes* 3.29 contains the essence of Horace's spirit. 'In that magnificent poem we find the Greek past alive in the Roman present, an inimitable blend of grandeur and intimacy, solemnity and humour; and a sad awareness of transience and insecurity combined with a tough-minded intention to survive' (p.404).

J.C.Bramble is responsible for several contributions. In his account of 'Minor figures' of the Augustan age readers will be interested to note that he dates the *Ciris*, which R.A.O. M.Lyne was prepared to put as late as the third century, to the same period as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (pp.469-470), and they will be glad to have recorded a conjecture by R.G.M.Nisbet on line 19 of Albinovanus Pedo (*nobis* for the paradosis *lib(er)is*) and a collection of Pedo's numerous allusions to Virgil, most of which have previously gone unnoticed (pp.489-491). On the satirical writers of the next period Bramble follows Townend and says that Juvenal's world 'is a mixture of memory, imagination, and literary reminiscence, peopled by monsters and caricatures' (pp.604-5). But he also goes further. Having posed perhaps the central question which confronts readers of Juvenal, Bramble avoids the extreme positions of H.A.Mason and P.Green, giving warm but qualified support to U.Knoche, for whom the poet's indignation 'is always genuine and sincere' (pp.606-7). Juvenal's exaggerations and grandiloquence, his struggle to create a grotesque yet epic pageant out of the Rome that inhabits his mind, these arise simply from his conception that vice is now at its peak (p.614).

While I admired the above sections by Bramble, his contribution on Lucan seems to me better still. *Logopoeia* is the poet's chosen mode, his diction showing him 'constantly at odds with conventional epic'; here Bramble in two pages skilfully summarizes the essence of Lucan's *delectus uerborum* and at the same time contrives to bring the poet himself to life (pp.541-2). Again, 'when faced with tired or unsuitable conventions, Lucan has constant recourse to one particular mannerism: the negation antithesis, *non* followed by *sed*' (p.544), an observation which Bramble uses fruitfully to extract significance from a variety of passages. Lucan 'remodels tradition to reflect his ignoble theme' (p.550) and completes 'a demolition of the recognized battle scene' (p.553). While not everything will command assent (e.g. the whiff of science detected in 5.608-10: pp.554-5), one cannot help but admire how Bramble, deeply familiar with the epic tradition, acutely observes Lucan's transformations of its standard techniques. Unlike Rudd, Bramble is not always easy reading; but in the contributions of these two writers there is some justification for the claim that the Cambridge History will attract the attention of scholars.

5. APPENDIX OF AUTHORS AND NOTES

The Appendix consists of a series of entries of which, as a general rule, each is devoted to a single author. The authors are listed in the order in which they appear in the History - with the exception of Seneca the Elder, who for some unexplained reason is listed last of all (even after Apuleius). Each entry is normally divided into three sections: 'Life', 'Works' and 'Bibliography', this last being subdivided into 'Texts and Commentaries', 'Translations', 'Studies', and 'Index(es)' or 'Concordance(s)' (if any). The material assembled under 'Life' and 'Works' is extremely convenient: that on the very early authors is particularly full and helpful (pp.799-830), while the younger Seneca also comes off well (pp.868-871). But the material collected under 'Bibliography', though from it I learned of a few items of which I was culpably unaware, is open to serious criticism.

There seem to me to be two areas of difficulty. In the first place, the bibliographies are often incomplete. Now granted that the intention was not to provide the exhaustive collection of references which feature in Schanz-Hosius and which are perhaps superfluous in view of the numerous survey-articles which appear regularly in learned journals today. Granted too that scholars will often disagree on which items merit a place in a selective bibliography. But I soon gave up noting the omission from the Cambridge Appendix of significant contributions which seem to me most appropriate for a volume of this type. Let me take as examples three successive entries on major authors. I have already mentioned that none of the several recent English biographies of Cicero is listed under his name; nor is Townend's excellent appraisal (1965) of Cicero's poetry. Under Sallust there is no reference to Lebek's study of his archaizing (1970); and under Caesar there is no reference to P.T.Eden's standard study of the style of the *commentarii* (1962). One could go on and on - to my ignorant eye the bibliography on the later Principate looks particularly thin: e.g. on the *Panegyrici* there is no mention of the work of Burdeau (1964), and Gutzwiller's commentary is wrongly classed as only a text.

Secondly, the bibliographies are often out of date and sometimes bear no relationship to the author-entry in the History proper. Here there is, I admit, a real problem. The volume was commissioned in 1971 but only appears in 1982. Moreover, as we are told in the preface (p.xiii), 'for the most part it has not been possible for contributors to take account of secondary literature later than 1975, but the Appendix of Authors and Works includes important items published subsequently'. As I understand it, contributors who had long since submitted

their essays were at a later stage invited to bring their bibliographies up to date. Some have done so (for example, recent books on the *Georgics* [1979 & 1980] and the elder Seneca [1978 & 1981] are mentioned), others have not (no reference to *Cato the Censor* [1978] by A. E. Astin), while others still have been patchy (thus Cairns' study of Tibullus is in [1979] but not that of Bright [1978] which preceded it; and - amazingly - Van Sickle [1978] is in on the structure of the *Eclogues* but not DuQuesnay [1977] on *Eclogue 4*). These gaps are regrettable, but even more depressing is the statement in the History that of Gallus' poetry 'only one line is preserved' (p.411), whereas the new fragment is not only listed in the Appendix but actually illustrated at the beginning of the book. The fragment was published in 1979 and gossiped about earlier. Was it really impossible to bring the History itself up to date? Again, we read on p.201 that 'perhaps no poem of Catullus has been so ... incompletely read' as 31, yet Cairns' full discussion of it (1974) is listed in the Appendix. Surely the whole point of a volume such as this is that it is up-to-date when it appears. A comparison with the *Cambridge Ancient History* is instructive. Volume 10 of that work, an even longer and more complicated production than the present History, appeared in 1934 but was able to take account of publications at least as late as 1932. No matter what problems were encountered during the gestation of the present History - and doubtless there were many - it seems to me that there was a responsibility to achieve a better state of affairs than this. If there were any plans for dividing the book into a series of paperback volumes, my most earnest recommendation would be that it is brought up to date and its bibliographies improved. Another recommendation is that any future copies be properly bound. The spine of the hard-back review copy is already adrift after only a couple of months - an inauspicious start for a work of reference selling at £40 and designed to last.

6. SUGGESTIONS

As has been seen, we are constantly made aware that the book is intended for non-specialists or for 'specialists in other European literatures'. But while some contributors make specific remarks about the language of the authors they discuss, I feel that the general reader might have profited from an attempt at describing the character of the Latin language and its historical development. Yet this is probably asking for the impossible, and in any case it may well be felt that such a subject lies properly outside the scope of a literary history.

We have also seen that the volume makes much of its intention to be critical and to reflect 'the increasing sophistication and vigour of critical work' on Latin literature. I think the reader would have benefitted considerably from an appraisal of the radical changes which have taken place in Latin literary criticism since the production of the last literary history in this country. For an idea of what can be achieved one need only refer to the masterly surveys of this type which Charles Segal and L.P. Wilkinson have already contributed to other publications. Had such a discussion been included, it would, one assumes, have taken account of Francis Cairns' work on generic composition, which appeared in 1972 (ten years before the appearance of the History and three years before its bibliographical deadline) but which has left little impression on the present volume: Cairns' book is mentioned only once, in a footnote in the essay by Vessey (p.564 n.2). Can it really be said, then, that the Cambridge History 'embodies the very considerable advances made by recent classical scholarship'?

In conclusion I cannot deny that my response to this volume of the Cambridge History is in direct proportion to the length of time during which I looked forward to its appearance. With the benefit of hindsight readers of this review will perhaps say that my disappointment is unreasonable and that I ought to have tempered my enthusiasm quite some time ago when it was first learned that the Greek and Latin volumes were not to appear simultaneously. Yet I do not think my enthusiasm was in any way incommensurate with the expectations which were expressed more than ten years ago in the notes to contributors (see above p.102). And besides, why should trouble be suspected simply because one's last volume is scheduled to appear before one's first ... ?